

New structure for the off-diagonal part of neutrino effective mass matrix*

WOJCIECH KRÓLIKOWSKI

Institute of Theoretical Physics, Warsaw University

Hoża 69, PL-00-681 Warszawa, Poland

Abstract

Two 3×3 matrices playing the role of annihilation and creation operators in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ are applied to construct the off-diagonal part of neutrino effective mass matrix M . The construction leads to a new relation between two off-diagonal elements $M_{e\mu}$ and $M_{\mu\tau}$ of M . In the case of tribimaximal neutrino mixing, this relation implies a new mass sum rule for ν_1, ν_2, ν_3 : $m_3 = \eta m_2 - (\eta - 1)m_1$. In a plausible option consistent with the charged-lepton mass spectrum, one gets $\eta \equiv (2/3)(4\sqrt{3} + 1) = 5.28547$. Then, $\Delta m_{32}^2 / \Delta m_{21}^2 = \eta^2 - 1 = 26.9362$ if $m_1 = 0$, what predicts $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ when the input $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 8.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ is used.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff, 14.60.Pq .

August 2006

*Work supported in part by the Polish Ministry of Higher Education and Science, grant 1 PO3B 099 29 (2005-2007).

1. Previous work

In a recent paper [1], we have proposed the new relation

$$M_{\mu\tau} = 4\sqrt{3} M_{e\mu} \quad (1)$$

between two off-diagonal elements of neutrino effective neutrino mass-matrix $M = (M_{\alpha\beta})$ ($\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$). This relation is valid, if the off-diagonal part of M is tentatively conjectured to be built up from two 3×3 matrices playing the role of annihilation and creation operators acting in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ and, in addition, if the neutrino flavor-weighting factors ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) defined in Eq. (12) get the specific values

$$\rho_e = \frac{1}{29}, \rho_\mu = \frac{4}{29}, \rho_\tau = \frac{24}{29}, \quad (2)$$

where $\sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha = 1$. In Ref. [1], the factors ρ_α have been tentatively assumed to be numerically equal to the fermion generation-weighting factors ρ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) which take the specific values (2), $\rho_1 = 1/29, \rho_2 = 4/29, \rho_3 = 24/29$, for all fundamental fermions and play a significant role in describing fermion mass spectra [2,3,4]. Especially, appearing in an efficient charged-lepton empirical mass formula, the factors ρ_i are consistent with the precisely measured mass spectrum m_e, m_μ, m_τ [3,4]. Consequently, in Ref. [1], the annihilation and creation operators in the neutrino-generation space of ν_1, ν_2, ν_3 have been applied, rather than those having the same matrix form in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ (see the comment after Eq. (12)).

In the case when the neutrino effective mixing matrix $U = (U_{\alpha i})$ ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau, i = 1, 2, 3$) is of the tribimaximal form [5]

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

that is reasonably consistent with all confirmed neutrino experiments, our relation (1) provides the new mass sum rule for ν_1, ν_2, ν_3

$$m_3 = \eta m_2 - (\eta - 1) m_1 \quad (4)$$

with the specific coefficient

$$\eta \equiv \frac{2}{3} (4\sqrt{3} + 1) = 5.28547. \quad (5)$$

In fact, in the tribimaximal case, the elements $M_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_i U_{\alpha i} m_i U_{\beta i}^*$ of the neutrino effective mass matrix M are:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ee} &= \frac{1}{3}(2m_1 + m_2), \\ M_{\mu\mu} &= M_{\tau\tau} = \frac{1}{6}(m_1 + 2m_2 + 3m_3), \\ M_{e\mu} &= -M_{e\tau} = -\frac{1}{3}(m_1 - m_2), \\ M_{\mu\tau} &= -\frac{1}{6}(m_1 + 2m_2 - 3m_3). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Two last equations (6), if inserted in the relation (1), give the mass sum rule (4) with (5).

If $m_1 = 0$, the mass sum rule (4) with (5) leads to the *prediction*

$$\Delta m_{32}^2 / \Delta m_{21}^2 = \eta^2 - 1 = 26.9362 \quad (7)$$

and hence, $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$, when the input of experimental estimate $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 8.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ [5] is used. The predicted Δm_{32}^2 is close to the popular experimental best fit $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ [6].

2. A less restrictive case

In the present paper, we find the counterpart of formula (1) in the case when the neutrino flavor-weighting factors ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) are not necessarily of the form (2) characteristic for the fermion generation-weighting factors ρ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), and where the neutrino mixing may deviate from the tribimaximal pattern (3).

To this end, let us make use of two matrices in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ :

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad a^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

satisfying the relations

$$n = a^\dagger a, [a, n] = a, [a^\dagger, n] = -a^\dagger, a^3 = 0, a^{\dagger 3} = 0. \quad (9)$$

Though $[a, a^\dagger] \neq \mathbf{1}$, such a and $a^\dagger$ play the role of annihilation and creation operators in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ , while

$$n = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

is the operator defining formal occupation numbers $n_\alpha = 0, 1, 2$ corresponding to three flavors $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ , respectively.

Then, it is natural to conjecture tentatively that for the off-diagonal part of neutrino effective mass matrix M the following constraining identity holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_{e\mu} & M_{e\tau} \\ M_{e\mu} & 0 & M_{\mu\tau} \\ M_{e\tau} & M_{\mu\tau} & 0 \end{pmatrix} &= \mu \rho^{1/2} [g(a + a^\dagger) + g'(a^2 + a^{\dagger 2})] \rho^{1/2} \\ &= \mu \begin{pmatrix} 0 & g\sqrt{\rho_e \rho_\mu} & g'\sqrt{2\rho_e \rho_\tau} \\ g\sqrt{\rho_e \rho_\mu} & 0 & g\sqrt{2\rho_\mu \rho_\tau} \\ g'\sqrt{2\rho_e \rho_\tau} & g\sqrt{2\rho_\mu \rho_\tau} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where g and g' are free parameters (multiplied by an active-neutrino mass scale $\mu > 0$), while

$$\rho^{1/2} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_e^{1/2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_\mu^{1/2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \rho_\tau^{1/2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Here, ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) are called the neutrino flavor-weighting factors, not necessarily equal to the fermion generation-weighting factors ρ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) ($\text{Tr} \rho \equiv \sum_\alpha \rho_\alpha = 1$). Formally, we have in Eq. (11) $\rho^{1/2} = (\rho_{\alpha\beta}^{1/2}) = (\delta_{\alpha\beta} \rho_\beta^{1/2})$ and $a = (a_{\alpha\beta})$. But, in the case of ρ_α taking as in Ref. [1] the plausible values (2) (numerically equal to ρ_i), we can alternatively write $\rho^{1/2} = (\rho_{\alpha i}^{1/2}) = (\delta_{\alpha i} \rho_i^{1/2})$ and $a = (a_{ij})$, the latter acting in the neutrino-generation space of ν_1, ν_2, ν_3 rather than in the neutrino-flavor space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ (here, both a 's have the same matrix form (8)). Above, we put $\delta_{\alpha i} = 1$ for $\alpha i = e 1, \mu 2, \tau 3$ and $= 0$ otherwise. Thus, in this case, the mechanism (11) constraining the off-diagonal

part of M can be interpreted as working entirely in the neutrino-generation space, since among all *a priori* possible components $\rho_{\alpha i}$ of ρ , only those with $\alpha i = e 1, \mu 2, \tau 3$ can be nonzero.

From the identity (11), it follows that

$$g = M_{e\mu}/(\mu \sqrt{\rho_e \rho_\mu}) = M_{\mu\tau}/(\mu \sqrt{2\rho_\mu \rho_\tau}) , \quad g' = M_{e\tau}/(\mu \sqrt{2\rho_e \rho_\tau}) \quad (13)$$

and hence,

$$M_{\mu\tau} = \sqrt{2\rho_\tau/\rho_e} M_{e\mu} . \quad (14)$$

Note that $M_{e\mu} = -M_{e\tau}$ in the case of bilarge or (in particular) tribimaximal neutrino mixing. Then, from Eq. (13)

$$g = -\sqrt{2\rho_\tau/\rho_\mu} g' . \quad (15)$$

In the tribimaximal case (see Eq. (6)), Eqs. (13) and (14) imply the parameter values

$$g = -\sqrt{2\rho_\tau/\rho_\mu} g' = \frac{1}{3}(m_2 - m_1)/\sqrt{\rho_e \rho_\mu} \quad (16)$$

and the neutrino mass sum rule

$$m_3 = \eta m_2 - (\eta - 1) m_1 \quad (17)$$

with the coefficient

$$\eta \equiv \frac{2}{3} (\sqrt{2\rho_\tau/\rho_e} + 1) . \quad (18)$$

In the case of ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) taking the plausible values (2), we get from Eqs. (16) and (18) the parameter values $g = -2\sqrt{3} g' = [29/(6\mu)](m_2 - m_1)$ and the coefficient $\eta \equiv (2/3)(4\sqrt{3} + 1) = 5.28547$ as given in Eq. (5).

3. Conclusion

In conclusion, the constraining identity (11), if it holds for the off-diagonal part of neutrino effective mass matrix M , means that this part is built up from two annihilation

and creation operators acting in neutrino flavor-space of ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ . Then, the new relation (14) is valid between $M_{e\mu}$ and $M_{\mu\tau}$, implying in the case of tribimaximal neutrino mixing the new neutrino mass sum rule presented in Eqs. (17) and (18). If, in addition, the flavor-weighting factors ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) take the plausible values (2), this mass sum rule is given as in Eqs. (4) and (5), while the relation (14) assumes the form (1).

For normal hierarchy of neutrino masses $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$, when the lowest mass is put in the range

$$m_1 \sim (0 \text{ to } 10^{-3}) \text{ eV} , \quad (19)$$

we infer from the experimental estimate $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 8.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ that

$$m_2 \sim (8.9 \text{ to } 9.0) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV} . \quad (20)$$

Then, making use of the mass sum rule (4) with (5), valid in the case of ρ_α taking the plausible values (2), we *predict*

$$m_3 \sim (4.7 \text{ to } 4.3) \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV} \quad (21)$$

and hence,

$$\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim (2.2 \text{ to } 1.8) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2 \quad (22)$$

for m_1 lying in the range (19). The value $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.2 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ is close to the popular experimental best fit $\Delta m_{32}^2 \sim 2.4 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ [6]. So, in the range (19), the value $m_1 \sim 0$ is implied. Then, $m_3 \sim \eta m_2$ from Eq. (17).

In the case of $m_1 = 0$, Eqs. (6) and (4) with (5) imply the relations

$$\begin{aligned} M_{ee} &= M_{e\mu} = -M_{e\tau} = \frac{1}{3}m_2 , \\ M_{\mu\mu} &= M_{\tau\tau} = \frac{1}{3}m_2 + \frac{1}{2}m_3 = (4\sqrt{3} + 2) \frac{1}{3}m_2 = 8.92820 \frac{1}{3}m_2 , \\ M_{\mu\tau} &= -\frac{1}{3}m_2 + \frac{1}{2}m_3 = 4\sqrt{3} \frac{1}{3}m_2 = 6.92820 \frac{1}{3}m_2 , \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $m_2 \sim 8.9 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}$. This leads to the proportion

$$M_{ee} : M_{e\mu} : (-M_{e\tau}) : M_{\mu\tau} : M_{\mu\mu} : M_{\tau\tau} = 1 : 1 : 1 : 4\sqrt{3} : (4\sqrt{3} + 2) : (4\sqrt{3} + 2) \quad (24)$$

for elements of the matrix M . Note that $\text{Tr}M = (\eta + 1)m_2 = 6.28547 m_2$.

4. Final remark

Note finally that the identity (11), involving the flavor-weighting factors ρ_α ($\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$) which take plausibly the same values as the generation-weighting factors ρ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$), is related in spirit with the empirical mass formula we have proposed recently [4] for active mass neutrinos ν_i of three generations $i = 1, 2, 3$. This formula reads

$$m_i = \mu \rho_i \left[1 - \frac{1}{\xi} \left(N_i^2 + \frac{\varepsilon - 1}{N_i^2} \right) \right], \quad (25)$$

where $N_i = 1 + 2n_i = 1, 3, 5$ ($n_i = 0, 1, 2$) and $\rho_i = 1/29, 4/29, 24/29$, while $\mu > 0$, ε and ξ are three free parameters. Explicitly, the mass formula (25) can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= \frac{\mu}{29} \left(1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} \right), \\ m_2 &= \frac{\mu}{29} 4 \left[1 - \frac{1}{9\xi} (80 + \varepsilon) \right], \\ m_3 &= \frac{\mu}{29} 24 \left[1 - \frac{1}{25\xi} (624 + \varepsilon) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Due to the formula (25) or (26), the mass sum rule (4) with (5), valid in the case of ρ_α taking the plausible values (2), imposes on two parameters ε and ξ the constraint

$$\frac{1}{\xi} = 0.0173763 - 0.0070452 \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi}. \quad (27)$$

For $m_1 = 0$, three parameters in the neutrino mass formula (25) or (26) take the values

$$\mu \sim 8.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}, \quad \frac{\varepsilon}{\xi} = 1, \quad \frac{1}{\xi} = 1.03311 \times 10^{-2}. \quad (28)$$

Here, in contrast to the value of μ , the values of ε/ξ and $1/\xi$ are independent of the input of experimental estimate $\Delta m_{21}^2 \sim 8.0 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$, since they are evaluated from the relations $m_1 = 0$ and $m_3 = \eta m_2$, where $\mu > 0$ is cancelled after Eqs. (26) are used ($m_1 = 0$ implies $\varepsilon/\xi = 1$).

References

- [1] W. Królikowski, [hep-ph/0606223](#) (here, the notation ρ_i is used also for ρ_α that is numerically equal to ρ_i).
- [2] W. Królikowski, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **36**, 2051 (2005) [[hep-ph/0503074](#)]; *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **37**, 1781 (2006) [[hep-ph/0510355](#)].
- [3] W. Królikowski, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **32**, 2961 (2001) [[hep-ph/0108157](#)], Appendix; *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **33**, 2559 (2002) [[hep-ph/0203107](#)]; and references therein.
- [4] W. Królikowski, [hep-ph/0602018](#); [hep-ph/0604148](#).
- [5] L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **18**, 958 (1978); P.F. Harrison, D.H. Perkins and W.G. Scott, *Phys. Lett. B* **458**, 79 (1999); *Phys. Lett. B* **530**, 167 (2002); Z.Z. Xing, *Phys. Lett. B* **533**, 85 (2002); P.F. Harrison, and W.G. Scott, *Phys. Lett. B* **535**, 163 (2003); T.D. Lee, [hep-ph/0605017](#).
- [6] *Cf. e.g.* G.L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone and A. Palazzo, [hep-ph/0506083](#); T. Schwetz [hep-ph/0606060](#); F. Valle, [hep-ph/0608101](#).